

The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America

VOLUME EIGHTEEN
PARTS ONE AND TWO
1924

GEORGE P. WINSHIP
CARL B. RODEN
ANDREW KEOGH
Publication Committee

The Society does not hold itself responsible for opinions
expressed by contributors of papers

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, London
THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka, Sendai
THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, Shanghai

COPYRIGHT 1925 BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

All Rights Reserved

Published December 1925
325 Copies Printed

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

OFFICERS

1924

- President:* AZARIAH S. ROOT, College Library, Oberlin, Ohio.
- First Vice-President:* HARRY M. LYDENBERG, Public Library, New York, N.Y.
- Second Vice-President:* CHARLES MARTEL, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
- Secretary:* AUGUSTUS H. SHEARER, The Grosvenor Library, Buffalo, N.Y.
- Treasurer:* FREDERICK W. FAXON, 41 Lorraine Street, Roslindale, Mass.
- Ex-President:* GEORGE WATSON COLE, Henry E. Huntington Library, San Gabriel, Calif.

<i>Councillors</i>	<i>Term expires</i>
ERNEST C. RICHARDSON, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.	1925
J. C. M. HANSON, University of Chicago Library, Chicago, Ill.	1926
WORTHINGTON C. FORD, The Massachusetts Historical Society, Fenway, Boston, Mass.	1927
GEORGE A. PLIMPTON, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. . .	1928

COMMITTEES

Finance: WILLIAM L. CLEMENTS, Bay City, Mich., *Chairman*

CARL B. RODEN, Chicago, Ill.

FREDERICK W. FAXON, *Treasurer*, ex officio

Membership: FREDERICK W. FAXON, *Chairman*

AUGUSTUS H. SHEARER

Publication: GEORGE PARKER WINSHIP, *Chairman*,

Widener Memorial Library, Cambridge, Mass.

ANDREW KEOGH, Yale University Library

CARL B. RODEN, Chicago Public Library

PICKWICKIAN CHRONOLOGY

By FRANK E. ROBBINS
University of Michigan

THERE seems to exist a widespread and well-founded prejudice against the breaking of butterflies upon wheels—one which is shared by the writer of this essay, and one which he hopes will not be outraged by the following pages. They were the product of a few evenings of leisure, a fondness for Dickens, and perhaps in some measure one of those suggestions popularly supposed to be forthcoming from the infernal regions when one's hands are not for the moment occupied. They do not pretend to represent any knowledge of bibliographical matters, for that is a blessing denied to him. They were written, in the first place, purely for the sake of amusement, and are printed only because they may amuse the lovers of Charles Dickens and his genial creation, Mr. Pickwick.

What I have attempted to do, in a word, is to apply to the *Pickwick Papers* the methods of philological research at least in so far as the chronology of the Pickwick Club's annals is concerned. It will be recalled that when Sam Weller was hired to be Mr. Pickwick's body servant, the history of Sam's conduct was found to be quite blameless with the exception of one "amiable indiscretion" in which an assistant housemaid had equally participated. The phrase is an alluring one, and applies splendidly to the chronological economy of the *Papers*. They are full of

amiable indiscretions, which are easy to detect if one follows the adventures of the Club with a calendar in hand, or in mind.

Of course, Dickens never intended that the *Pickwick Papers* should be analyzed in this way—unless he was a more subtle humorist than he is usually credited with being; but there are few of his novels that have more references to time. It abounds in such expressions as “the next day,” “the next but one,” and so on; several times actual dates are given, and at least once Dickens must have looked up an old calendar to verify the day of the week for a certain date. Hence, the construction of a time-table for the *Papers* is not at all hard, and it is a most amusing occupation for an evening when one might perhaps be doing something more profitable.

It may be wise to remark that the adventures of the Pickwick Club can be divided roughly into eight episodes, and by recounting them to remind the reader of the main events of the book. Each episode, with two exceptions, takes the Club away from London on some quest, and brings it back at the finish. In the first, the Club goes to Rochester, attends the ball and the review, meets Mr. Jingle, visits Dingley Dell and Muggleton (where the world’s greatest cricket match, and the only one an American is likely to become interested in, takes place), pursues Jingle to London, goes back to Mr. Wardle’s with the retrieved maiden aunt, and then comes home via Cobham. The second is the episode of the Eatanswill election, Mrs. Leo Hunter’s breakfast, and the events at Bury St. Ed-

munds. The third is the short trip to Ipswich, where Mr. Peter Magnus and the magistrate, Mr. Nupkins, are added to the picture. The fourth is the Christmas party at Wardle's; the fifth, entirely at London, is the famous trial of *Bardell v. Pickwick*; the sixth is the trip to Bath; the seventh at Fleet Prison; and the eighth includes Mr. Pickwick's visit to the elder Winkle and the final convivial scenes in London.

Each of these episodes contains amusing chronological inconsistencies. The first, and one of the worst, occurs very close to the beginning, and was apparently noticed by Dickens himself. You will recall that Mr. Jingle, who had done everything, was also a poet, and had composed an "epic poem—ten thousand lines—revolution of July—composed it on the spot—Mars by day, Apollo by night—bang the field piece, twang the lyre." "You were present at that glorious scene, sir?" said Mr. Snodgrass. "Present! think I was; fired a musket—fired with an idea—rushed into a wine shop—wrote it down—back again—whiz bang—another idea—wine shop again—pen and ink—back again—cut and slash—noble time, sir," replies Mr. Jingle, and Dickens in his only footnote says: "A remarkable instance of the prophetic force of Mr. Jingle's imagination; this dialogue occurring in the year 1827 and the Revolution in 1830." The fact is that the first meeting of the Pickwick Club took place, as Dickens explicitly says, on May 12, 1827, and this dialogue the next day.

Mr. Dickens really should have looked up this date in the calendar, as I did. If he had, I think he would have

deferred the trip to Rochester a day or two, for May 12 was Saturday in 1827, and though the graceless Jingle might have traveled on the Sabbath readily enough, I doubt whether the good Mr. Pickwick would have done so. Yet he starts off on a Sunday morning without compunction, and in the crowd at the coach station there is a hot-pieman, whose recipe for stopping the fight between the Club and the cabman is "Put 'em under the pump!" I suppose that the said pastry-vendor did not realize that he was violating the unrepealed Sunday Observance Act of 1677, which forbids any person publicly to cry, shew forth, or expose for sale, any wares, merchandises, fruit, herbs, goods, or chattels whatsoever on the Lord's Day or any part thereof, on pain of forfeiting said goods. Those pies might have been claimed by the Crown.

Mr. Pickwick, however, is made a hardened Sabbath-breaker; he is not at all offended to see that the good people of Rochester have made all preparations for their ball on Sunday evening, and Mr. Tupman must have been very drunk, indeed, so to forget his principles as actually to attend it.

This is not the only case of Sabbath-breaking that occurs in the book. The party constantly travel on that day of the week.

The first episode illustrates very well Dickens' tendency to hurry and get ahead of the calendar. The events can be followed very accurately. The ball at Rochester took place May 13, the abortive duel with Dr. Slammer on the fourteenth, the review on the fifteenth, the journey to

Dingley Dell on the sixteenth, and Mr. Tupman's accident and the cricket match on the seventeenth. Mr. Jingle arrives that night and begins to set his snares for the heart of Miss Rachel on the eighteenth; for three afternoons and evenings, the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first, Mr. Tupman appears cold to Miss Rachel, so that on the day of the elopement, the twenty-second, Mr. Wardle's suspicions are entirely dissipated. All that night he and Mr. Pickwick pursue the amorous pair, and break down on the morning of May 23, arriving in London on either the twenty-third or twenty-fourth of May, according as we interpret the statement that Sam Weller was brushing the shoes of the travelers "on the morning succeeding the events related in the last chapter." Probably it was May 24; on this day occurs the scene with the mercenary Jingle, and on the twenty-fifth the return to Dingley Dell, to find that Mr. Tupman has gone to Cobham. Next day the Pickwickians follow him. This will be May 26, yet Dickens remarks: "It was a pleasant afternoon in June." To be sure, he missed it only by a week.

Follow the events a bit farther and the discrepancy widens. May 27, the next day, which, by the way, was a Sunday, the Pickwickians returned to London and spent "three or four days" preparing for the visit to Eatanswill. Sam was hired and Mr. Pickwick's embarrassing adventure with Mrs. Bardell took place on the day before the start, or about May 31, 1827. On June 1 they started and arrived the same evening at Eatanswill, where they seem to have witnessed the whole drama of the election. Since

elections in England at this period consumed a total of fifteen days, Mr. Slumkey can hardly have been returned before June 16, and Mrs. Leo Hunter's invitation, on the third morning after the election, must have been received on June 19. Her party took place the next day, June 20, yet Dickens in speaking of the journey to Bury St. Edmunds, which the Pickwickians undertook that same afternoon, remarks: "There is no month in the whole year in which nature wears a more beautiful appearance than in the month of August." This may be so, but to say it in June is merely an interesting, but scarcely a timely, observation.

The worst slip is yet to come. The day after his arrival in Bury, Mr. Pickwick makes his unconventional call on the girls' school and in consequence is confined to his room for three days with rheumatism, i.e., from Friday, June 22, through Sunday, June 24, 1827. Mr. Wardle is with him the last of these days, and the rest of the Club rejoin him, apparently, on the twenty-fifth. Their movements in the interval of their separation from their leader are rather hard to follow, but, at any rate, they are again assembled on or about the twenty-fifth of June, 1827, when Mr. Pickwick reads the letter from Dodson and Fogg. Well might it cause him consternation, for it is dated August 28, 1830. Evidently that unfortunate Revolution has been on Dickens' mind all this time. It has caused him to leap over three whole years and two months. However, from this point on we shall let him have his way, since here he establishes for the second time a definite date.

I must pause here for a moment to pay a tribute to the miraculous efficiency, at this early time, of the British postal service. According to the revised chronology which Dickens now adopts, Mr. Pickwick read the letter on August 30, 1830, for we are told that the "next day but one" was September 1; it had arrived, however, two days before Sam Weller found it at the post-office. Hence it was received at Bury August 28, 1830, the very day on which it was written and posted in London, 87 miles away. This would be a sufficient feat, but, as a matter of fact, I think it was yet more remarkable. Dodson and Fogg probably knew that Mr. Pickwick had gone to Eatanswill—Mrs. Bardell could have told them so much—but did they know he had gone to Bury? He made this latter journey entirely on the spur of the moment. The letter must have gone to Eatanswill and been forwarded by the intelligent authorities at that mythical city to Bury, all in one and the same day.

Thus far I have followed Mr. Pickwick's movements quite minutely, but I do not intend to bore you by too great explicitness. We may merely remark that at this point Dickens probably looked at a calendar, for he says that the party decided to leave for London on Thursday, September 2, makes quite a bit of conversation over this date, and, in fact, insists with evident pride upon it. Now in 1830, September 2 did fall on a Thursday, and I do not think that Dickens was fortunate enough in the matter of dates to hit upon it correctly without looking it up.

We pass now to the closing episodes of the book, and

for the purpose of dramatic climax it is fortunate that some of the most amusing discrepancies of chronology come at the very end. The famous suit of *Bardell v. Pickwick*, at which Sergeant Buzfuz and Mr. Weller, Sr., so distinguished themselves, came, as everybody knows, most appropriately on February 14, 1831. On the sixteenth Mr. Pickwick went to Bath, attended a ball on the seventeenth, and certainly very soon after this took part of a house, since, as we are told, he contemplated staying two months. He intended, that is, to leave Bath about April 20, and there is no indication that he changed his mind on this important point. In fact, Dickens says: "The remainder of the period which Mr. Pickwick had assigned as the duration of the stay at Bath passed over without the occurrence of anything material." That is, two months have passed and it is toward the end of April. But the next words show that it is really later: "Trinity Term commenced." Now, previous to the passage of the Judicature Act of 1873, Trinity Term was from May 22 to June 12, hence Mr. Pickwick actually overstayed himself a month. "On the expiration of the first week" he returned to the George and Vulture, London, that is, on Saturday, May 28, 1831, or possibly, ascribing to Mr. Pickwick stricter Sabbatarian principles than his creator usually gives him, Monday, May 30. He entered Fleet Prison on the third day after his arrival—that is, on May 31 or June 2.

The prison episode furnishes another curious slip. We can reckon roughly the length of Mr. Pickwick's incarceration. Dickens relates the events of the second, third, and

fourth days after his arrival; then comes the visit of Mrs. Weller and Mr. Stiggins, the "shepherd," of which he says only that it was "a few mornings after" Sam himself entered the Fleet. From this time on, however, we are told that "for three long months" Mr. Pickwick kept closely to his room. In other words, his term of imprisonment lasted somewhat more than three months, probably two weeks more, or, if he entered on or about June 1, he left the Fleet, probably, between September 10 and September 15.

Now let us look at it from another angle, and we find we are mistaken. Mr. Pickwick had sworn that he would never pay the costs of his suit to Dodson and Fogg, and he was induced finally to do so, and to emerge from prison, only because, in the first place, he was sorry for Mrs. Bardell, who had been sent to the Fleet by those sharp practitioners in default of paying these same costs, and in the second place Mr. Winkle and his charming Arabella required his aid. It is made very clear that Mr. Pickwick left prison on the afternoon of the day after Mrs. Bardell was brought there, and we have already seen that this must have been about the middle of September; yet we are told that the little family party at the Spaniards, in Hampstead, from which Mrs. Bardell was so rudely snatched, took place "within a week of the close of July," when Mr. Pickwick could have been imprisoned for only two months, or less.

This history now closes with a most remarkable burst of speed. Please notice, too, how careful Dickens is to tell

us exactly when these events took place, so carefully that there can be no mistaking his meaning. Mr. Pickwick left prison, as we have said, to come to the aid of Mr. Winkle and Arabella, who, as Mr. Winkle admits, have been married three days. Note this. He steps outside the doors of the Fleet at exactly three o'clock. Note this also and recall that Mr. Pickwick is depicted as an elderly man to whom rapid locomotion is at least painful, if not impossible.

We next read how Arabella's aunt called on Bob Sawyer and Ben Allen at Bristol, clear across England from London, something more than 100 miles away as the crow flies. The time must be afternoon, for Messrs. Sawyer and Allen are discovered at dinner, and Dickens takes great pains to tell us that it must be the very day on which Mr. Pickwick came out of prison, for he makes the old lady say that Arabella has been gone three days and she has written that she is married. But the words are hardly out of her mouth, and Ben Allen is still trying to wreak vengeance on the solemn coachman, when Mr. Pickwick and Sam Weller appear on the scene. They have come from London to Bristol since three o'clock, and as a somewhat lengthy argument is necessary to persuade Ben and Bob that it is no use to be angry over Arabella's escapade, and all this takes place before tea-time, for the old lady invites Mr. Pickwick, at the close of the conversation, to tea, there is scarcely an hour, or a half-hour, to assign them for making the journey. The problem in locomotion puts to the blush the mystery of Edwin Drood.

The adjective "Pickwickian" has come to mean to all

of us something that is delightfully fantastic and not strictly in accord with the stern facts of the world. The foregoing paragraphs are sufficient, I believe, to demonstrate that one of the most Pickwickian features of the *Pickwick Papers* is their chronology. I have not told how Mr. Pickwick is apparently made to begin preparations in September for the Christmas party at Wardle's, nor how at the end of the book Mr. Pickwick visits Mr. Perker on "a fine October morning," which was more probably one in September, or even August. But I still feel some compunctions for ever having initiated an inquiry of this sort, for, after all, what difference does it make, and what a small thing is chronological accuracy in a Pickwickian world!

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL PITFALLS— LINKED BOOKS

BY GEORGE WATSON COLE, L.H.D.

Librarian Emeritus of the Henry E. Huntington Library

A NORMAL book consists of a title-page, giving a general idea of its contents, followed by a number of preliminary leaves, usually paged, if at all, by Roman numerals. These leaves are succeeded by the text of the book with a continuous pagination from beginning to end and a single series of signature-marks. The text usually relates to a single subject and occupies the entire volume.

There are other books of an opposite nature made up of separate parts. These usually contain a comprehensive title-page and sometimes a continuous series of signature-marks and pagination, but these are often irregular, beginning anew as the different parts of the volume are reached. The distinct parts often contain separate title-pages and are so imposed by the printer that they can be detached from the rest of the volume and bound separately without their origin in any way being indicated. Such books may be termed "linked books."

No class of books causes the bibliographer greater perplexity than those that come to him separately bound but which he later discovers were issued with one or more other works. These, in most cases, when examined critically, are found to contain certain characteristics that awaken suspicion, such as irregularity in signature-marks, page

numbers, etc. Some, however, contain nothing that excites distrust.

Books so issued are more or less closely connected with one another by a general title-page, register, pagination etc., and are originally published in a single volume. They usually have independent title-pages and, in some cases, may have previously appeared as separate publications. The presence of independent title-pages readily permits of their being separated from the collection as originally issued, and when so separated and bound they easily pass as independent works. When loosely linked they easily escape detection; but, if closely linked, as by signature-marks or pagination, or both, these earmarks lead to their detection as excerpts and throw suspicion upon them when they are found parading as separate publications.

Books may be said to be loosely linked when they are united only by mention on a collective title-page, in the list of contents, or elsewhere in the preliminary leaves. A good example of the first of these is Bacon's tract entitled *The Use of the Law*, London, 1629, described below. In this case its title is mentioned on the collective title-page; but when the tract itself is examined it is found to have all the earmarks of a separate publication, such as (*a*) a separate title-page; (*b*) separate signature-marks; and (*c*) a separate series of page numbers. With all these elements, which characterize a separately published book or pamphlet, this tract may readily be detached from its original connection and bound separately, and no one, unless previously apprised of the fact, would ever suspect that it had originally formed an integral part of another publication.

A book may also form a part of a collected work and only be linked to it by mention in the list of contents. Such examples, fortunately, are of the utmost rarity. Should a book so linked have all the elements of a separate publication—its own title-page, pagination, and signature-marks—its detection as a linked book, if discovered separately bound, would be even more difficult than in the case just mentioned.

Examples of two loosely linked books occur in *The Black Devill or Apostate*, by Thomas Adams (1615). To the general title is added *Together with The Wolfe Worring the Lambes* and *The Spirituall Navigator bound For the Holy Land in Three Sermons*. The last two of these, however, have distinct title-pages, signature-marks, and pagination, and if bound separately would never be thought of as anything but separate publications.

Another example of a linked book, called for only in the Prologue of the work which precedes it, is a work entitled *To a Devoute Man in Temperall Estate*, by Walter Hilton. This is appended to Pynson's edition of John Capgrave's *Kalendre of the Newe Legende of Englande* (1516). Hilton's work, though without folio numbers, has a separate caption or title and set of signatures. The only discoverable link connecting it with Capgrave's work is a sentence in the *Prologe* which announces that "In y^e latter ende of this boke is a lytell draught of Mayster water Hyltō of the med-lyfe fhewynge by whone it fhulde be vfed."

The colophon of *The Devoute Man* has the date 1506, apparently a misprint for 1516. This, because a copy of

this part is bound separately in King's College, Cambridge,¹ has led to the belief that there was an edition published in 1506. Another copy, also bound separately, was in the Huth Library,² but in this case it was correctly considered not to be a distinct edition but to belong to the *Kalendre of the New Legende of England*.

More curious still is the case of *A Learned and Godly Sermon Preached . . . at the Funerall of M^r Robert Boston*, by Nicholas Estwick (1633). This apparently separate work is appended to Mr. Bolton's *Last and Learned Worke of the last Things*, etc. (1633). One, however, looks in vain for the connecting link until he reads the "Advertisement to the Reader," on the verso of leaf [d2] toward the end of which we find:

There is also in this edition added, more then in the former, a pious and powerful *Sermon* preached at the Funerall of this Worthy *Author*, which drew abundance of teares from the eyes of the then present *Auditors*, and may further worke on the *Readers* thereof.

In later editions attention to this sermon was called for on the title-pages.

A firmly linked book is one which, notwithstanding it has a separate title-page, has signature-marks, pagination, or both, continuous with the other parts of the volume. Should such a book be bound separately, suspicion would at once be aroused on discovering that the first page of the text begins with an irregular series of signature-marks, be they letters or numbers. Distrust would become certainty

¹ *Bibliog. Soc., Hand-List; Richard Pynson*, p. 7.

² *Cat.*, II, 700n; *Sale*, Vol. III, No. 3696.

when on looking at such a volume the first signature-mark is found to be "Bb" or some other than the usual "B" with which the text of most sixteenth- and seventeenth-century books begin.

A book, therefore, in which both the pagination and signature-marks are in continuation of something that precedes it may be considered as firmly linked. Whenever, therefore, an attempt is made to palm it off as a distinct publication, a cursory examination shows at once that it has been separated from its original connection.

Between books that are loosely linked and those that are firmly linked there is a third class composed of those that to the unsuspecting may be passed off as properly being separate books. To this class should be assigned a book that has its own title-page and a separate pagination or none at all. In the early seventeenth century more unpaged books were published than now, hence the lack of page or folio numbers was not then looked upon as strange or unusual. This practice was in common use among Elizabethan printers. It will be observed in examining this class of books that the practice of numbering the leaves or pages sometimes varies even in a single volume. A striking example in which all three methods occur is found in each of the collected editions of Drayton's *Poems* of 1605, 1608, 1610, and 1613. The first part of these volumes has page numbers, the second part carries only folio numbers, while the third part has neither. As each part of these volumes has separate signature-marks the printer may have purposely employed this device so that the binder might

make no mistake in gathering the sheets, as by running them quickly through his fingers he could immediately tell if any sheet was out of its proper place.

The early editions of Bacon's *Use of the Law*, to which reference has already been made, are interesting as showing the different methods by which it was linked with the other works in which it appeared. The first edition was published in 1629 as a pendant to *The Lawyers Light*, by Sir John Doddridge.

The description that follows illustrates the method employed in the Henry E. Huntington Library in cataloguing its collection of works of English literature printed previous to the year 1641. Of these, at the present time (May, 1923), it contains about 8,250 volumes—the largest collection in existence outside of the British Museum and the University Libraries at Oxford and Cambridge.

DODDRIDGE or DODERIDGE, Sir JOHN. (b. 1555, d. 1628.)
1629

THE LAWYERS LIGHT [with] **THE VSE OF THE LAW** [by Francis Bacon]. LONDON, for *Benjamin Fisher*, 1629.

Small quarto. First Edition. Printed with side-notes but without running head-lines.

COLLATION BY SIGNATURES: ¶, 4 leaves (the first blank and genuine); A, 4 leaves (the last blank and genuine); B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, K, L, M, N, O, P, Q, A–N, each 4 leaves (the last blank and genuine). Total 120 numbered leaves.

COLLATION BY PAGINATION: [1 blank leaf], [¶];—[title], | **THE LAWYERS LIGHT:**| OR,| A due direction for the study of the | Law; for | *Methodes*.| *Choyce of Bookes moderne*.| *Selection of Au-*

thours of more antiquitie. | *Application of either.* | *Accommodation of*
diuers other vfefull requifits. | All tending to the speedy and more
eafie at- | tayning of the knowledge of the Common Law | of this
Kingdome. | With neceffary cautions againft certaine abufes or |
ouerfights, afwell in the PraCtitioner as Student. | *Written by the*
Reuerend and learned profeffor | *thereof, I. D.* | To which is annexed
for the affinitie of the | Subiect, another Treatife, called | *The Vfe*
of the Law. | [by Francis Bacon] | [single-rule] | ¶ Imprinted at
London for *Beniamin Fiſher*, and | are to be fold at his fhop in
Alderſgate ſtreet, | at the ſigne of the *Talbot*. 1629. |, recto of [¶ 2];—
[blank], verſo of [¶ 2];— | [type-ornament head-piece] | *TO THE*
READER. |, recto of ¶₃ to recto of [¶ 4];— [blank], verſo of [¶ 4];—
| [type-ornament head-piece] | In praife of the worke. | [12 lines of
verſe, ſigned] | W. T. |, recto of A;— [blank], verſo of A;— | type-
ornament head-piece] | Another. | [10 verſes in 12 lines, ſigned] | I.
S. |, recto of A₂;— [blank], verſo of A₂;— [contents of Doddridge's
work, with heading] | [type-ornament head-piece] | *THE TABLE.* |,
recto and verſo of A₃;— [1 blank leaf], [A₄];— [text, beginning] |
[conventional head-piece] | *ARISTOTLE* in the firſt book | of his
Topickes . . . |, pp. (1)–(119);— | *FINIS*. |, p. (119);— [blank],
p. [(120)].

II.

(The Vſe of the Law, by Francis Bacon.)

[title], | *THE VSE* | *OF THE* | *LAW.* | Provided for Prefervation |
OF |

Our { *Perſons.*
Goods, and
Good Names.

| According to the PraCtife | OF |

The { *Lawes*
and
Cuſtomes } of this Land.

| [single-rule] | [type-ornaments] | [single-rule] | LONDON. | Printed for BEN: FISHER, and are to | bee fold at his Shop without *Alderfgate*, at the | Signe of the *Talbot*. 1629. |, recto of [A] (second series);— [blank], verso of [A];— [contents of Bacon's work, with heading] | [type-ornament head-piece] | A Table of the Contents of | this enfuing Treatife. |, recto of A2 to verso of [A4];— [text, divided into five parts, with heading] | [conventional head-piece] | THE | VSE OF THE | LAW, | *And wherein it Principally* | *Consisteth*. |, pp. (1)–(93);— ||2 single-rules| *FINIS*. |, p. (93);— [blank], p. [(94)];— [1 blank leaf], [N4].

The catchword on the recto of [A4] (second series) is "9. By" instead of "By" and on p. (10) (second numbering) it is "they" instead of "may." Page (57) (second numbering) is wrongly numbered (56).

CONDITION: Size of leaf, 6 7|8×5 3|8 inches; 17.5×13.7 centimetres. In contemporary sprinkled-calf binding, with red label; sides tooled in blind with two frames of fillets; with red edges.

OTHER COPIES.

British Museum; Bodleian; University Library, Cambridge; Library of Congress; Columbia University; Boston Athenæum; Harvard Law Library; and Cleveland Public Library.

REFERENCES.

Sayle, 2(1902), no. 4958; Hazlitt, *Collections and Notes; Third Series* (1887), 290; British Museum, *Books to 1640*, 1 (1884), 437; Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*; Bliss, 2 (1815), 426.

The Bridgewater House copy, with ex-libris.

The First Edition.

The First Edition (1629), "for Beniamin Fisher," second title-page the same, is that here described.

This edition contains two separate works linked by the general title-page: Doddridge's *Lawyers Light* and Bacon's *Use of the Law*.

Doddridge's work was later included in his *The English Lawyer*,

1631 (our no. ———.), with text beginning, on V3 recto: "Methodus studendi. ARistotle in the first booke of his Topicks. . . ." Of this part of *The English Lawyer* "The Printer to the Reader" says: "The latter part of this Volume was heretofore printed by an imperfect Copie from a then unknown Author, under the title of The Lawyers Light; We now reprint it in fair light, by the Authours owne Copie. . . ."

Bacon's work subsequently appeared in his *Elements Of The Common Lawes Of England*, 1630, 1636, and 1639. Copies of all of these are in the Henry E. Huntington Library.

No license for the work as a whole has been found; "The Lawyers Grammar or a Method for the stud[y]ing of the lawe by J.D." (Doddridge's *Lawyers Light* ?) was entered Oct. 19, 1627, by Benjamin ffisher but later cancelled. (cf. Arber, *Transcripts*, 4:187.)

"The second treatise is by Francis Bacon, and was possibly printed by B. Alsop."—Sayle, 2:4958.

Fuller in his *Worthies* (1662), 257, observes of Doddridge that "it is hard to say, whether he was better Artist, Divine, Civil, or Common lawyer," and that "he held the scales of justice with so steady an hand, that neither love nor lucre, fear or flattery, could bow him on either side," praise which it is remarked in the Dictionary of National Biography (5:1063) "is hardly borne out by his conduct in the commendam case and the five knights' case. Hearing him pleading at the bar, Bacon is said to have remarked, 'It is done like a good archer, he shoots a fair compass.' From a habit of shutting his eyes while listening intently to a case, he acquired the sobriquet of 'the sleeping judge.' A curious incident occurred at the Huntingdon assizes in 1619. Doddridge having severely animadverted on the quality of the jurors, the sheriff gave to the next panel a fictitious set of names, such as Mamilian, prince of Tozland; Henry, prince of Godmanchester, and the like, which being read over with great solemnity, Doddridge is said not to have detected the imposition."—*Dict. Natl. Biog.*, 5(1908), 1063.

It seems unnecessary to give detailed descriptions of the later editions of *The Use of the Law*. Its bibliographical history, however, may be summarized as follows:

THE USE OF THE LAW

The First Edition (1629), "for Ben: Fisher," (A-N in 4s, last blank) is included, as already fully described, with separate title-page, register, and paging, in Sir John Doddridge's *The Lawyers Light*, 1629.

The Second Edition (1630), "by the Assignes of Iohn Moore, Esquire," (A-M₂ in 4s) is included with separate title-page, register, and paging, in Bacon's *The Elements Of The Common Lawes Of England*, 1630.

The Third Edition (1635), "by the Assignes of Iohn Moore, Esquire," ([O₄]-Aa₃ in 4s) is included with separate title-page and paging, but with continuous register in the Second Edition of his *Elements*, 1636.

The Fourth Edition (1639), "by the Assignes of Iohn Moore, Esquire," ([O₄]-Aa₃ in 4s) is included with separate title-page and paging, but with continuous register, in the Third Edition of Bacon's *Elements*, 1639.

This work, like Bacon's other law tracts, was not published until after his death. Bacon's

tracts on legal subjects were many, having for their object the elucidation of the laws and customs of the land. The *Maxims* were probably written in 1597, and first published in 1630 with the second edition of *The Use of the Law*. There are at least two manuscripts of the tract, one in the Cambridge Library and the other in the British Museum. They are not identical, for the former, bearing the date of 1596, is a much shorter document, having twenty rules only instead of twenty-five, as in the Harleian manuscript at the British

Museum. It is probable that Bacon himself made additions to the smaller copy. It is quite possible that *The Use of the Law* may be "spurious." Of the two manuscripts of this known to Heath, one was among the Harleian papers and the other with the Sloane collection. In neither case did the author's name appear, and their texts differ. It was probably written about the same period as the *Maxims*, and appeared in print for the first time in 1629. It was then published anonymously in the same quarto with Sir John Dodderidge's *Lawyer's Light*, bearing a distinct title-page and having a separate pagination. In the following year [1630] a second edition appeared with the first issue of the *Maxims of the Law* as we have seen, and in this quarto we find a general title-page, and also a separate one to each treatise. Here we notice for the first time on the title of *The Use of the Law*, "By the L: Verulam Viscount of S. Albon's," etc.¹

Another and somewhat complicated series of linked books has yet to be described.

In the year 1623, Sir James Ware having discovered several manuscripts relating to the history of Ireland in the library of Archbishop Ussher published two of them in a single volume. Its title-page reads: "*Two Histories of Ireland*. The one Written by Edmund Campion, the other by Meredith Hanmer Dr. of Divinity. Dublin. Printed by the Society of Stationers. M. DC. XXXIII." This title, in letterpress, is printed within an architectural border with the imprint in a panel at the base and a Tudor rose surmounted by a crown in the pediment.

The volume collates as follows: ¶⁶, A-L,⁶ M,⁴ Aa-Ss,⁶ Tr⁴; total 188 numbered leaves.

¹ Steeves, pp. 155-56.

It is made up as follows: title-page, verso blank; dedication to Thomas Lord Viscount Wentworth, one leaf; Preface, one leaf; dedication to Robert Dudley, Baron of Denbigh, signed "Edmund Campion," three pages; "To the Loving Reader," two pages; blank, one page; Campion's *Historie*, pages 1-138; Faults escaped, verso blank, one leaf; *Chronicle*, by Hanmer, pages 1-206; Henry Marleborough's *Chronicle*, pages 207-223; one blank leaf.

Hanmer's work of 206 pages follows Campion's of 138 pages, and is in turn followed by Henry of Marlborough's *Chronicle*, of which Ware makes no mention in his Preface or elsewhere. Hanmer's *Chronicle* has its own pagination and set of signature-marks (Aa-Sf, each 6 leaves; Tt, 4 leaves, the last blank). The whole, as the title indicates, constitutes a single volume, Hanmer's part being linked to that of Campion's by the wording of the title. Copies as usually bound are followed by the first edition of Edmund Spenser's *View of the State of Ireland*, 1633, which, as will presently be seen, is closely connected with this edition of the works of Campion and Hanmer.

In July 1580, Edmund Spenser, then twenty-eight years of age, was appointed secretary to Lord Grey—personified in Book V of *The Faerie Queene* as Sir Artegall—who was then going to Ireland as lord deputy. With the exception of two short visits to England, Ireland thenceforth became Spenser's home and remained so until within a month of his death, in 1598.

During his second visit to England, from the close of

1595 to early in 1597, he wrote his most elaborate work in prose, *A View of the State of Ireland*. Although this was licensed to Mathewe Lowndes, April 14, 1598,¹ it remained in manuscript until 1633, when it was discovered by Sir James Ware and published by him at Dublin in a folio volume.

The title-page as originally published reads: "*A View of the State of Ireland, Written Dialogue-wise betweene Endoxus and Irenæus*, By Edmund Spenser Esq. in the yeare 1596. Dublin, Printed by the Society of Stationerys, M. DC. XXXIII." This letterpress title is printed within the same architectural border as the *Two Histories of Ireland*, by Campion and Hanmer, described above. These we are inclined to believe, for reasons given below, were printed before Spenser's *View*.

The volume collates as follows: ¶⁴, A-K⁶, L⁴; total 68 numbered leaves, or 72 leaves if sheet "k," comprising the "Annotations," is included.

The volume contains title-page, verso blank; dedication to Thomas, Lord Viscount Wentworth, signed "James Ware," one leaf; Preface, three pages, followed by a blank page; text, pages 1-119; "Faults escaped," page 120; "Certaine verses of Mr. Edm. Spenser's," four leaves.

A copy of this work (the Lefferts-Winans copy), as here described, bound separately (without the "Annotations") is in the Huntington Library. In this respect it corresponds with the copy in Bradshaw, *Collection of Irish*

¹ Arber, *Transcripts*, III, 111.

Books, in the University Library, Cambridge (press-mark, Hib. 4. 63.5).

Ware began printing the *View* without side-notes and it was not until he reached page 40 that he changed his plan and began to insert them. From this point onward they frequently occur to the end of the volume. To supply the omission of these notes in the early pages he printed four leaves of "Annotations," the presence of which he explains as follows: "Upon review of that part which was printed, before I began to insert notes, these few animadversions are added." These leaves are paged in continuation of the text and carry the signature-mark, "k." That these leaves were an after-thought and printed subsequently to the rest of the volume is further shown by the four leaves containing "*Certaines verses* of Mr. Edm. Spenser's," which though unpagged, bear the signature-mark "L" in continuation of the regular series.

Though the "Annotations" are found in most copies, their absence, owing to the irregular signature-mark of the sheet on which they are printed, would pass unnoticed unless compared with a copy containing them. A copy separately bound, apparently with the "Annotations," is in the University Library, Cambridge (press-mark, Hib. 4. 63.2).

This volume bears every evidence of having been printed for separate publication, though it is usually found bound with the *Two Histories of Ireland* brought out by Ware the same year.

Having thus published these two volumes, Ware appears to have conceived the idea of uniting them in a single one. In order to do so and link them together, he changed the title-page of Spenser's *View of the State of Ireland* by appending to the original title the words: "Whereunto is added the History of Ireland. By Edmund Campion." This enabled him to make use of the greater popularity of Spenser by placing his work before those of the two less-known authors, Campion and Hanmer, in the single volume in which he had printed them. Here, then, we find the third issue of Spenser's *View of the State of Ireland*, with the title changed to include Campion's *History*, with which, of course, follows that of Hanmer. Not one of these authors was then living, all having died more than a quarter of a century before—Campion in 1581, Spenser in 1599, and Hanmer, of the plague in Dublin, in 1604.

Curiously enough, in most existing copies Spenser's *View*, even with the title reading "Whereunto is added," etc., is bound after the volume containing the works of Campion and Hanmer. Copies so bound are in the Huntington Library, the University Library, Cambridge (press-mark, Hib. 4. 63. 5), and elsewhere.

Hanmer's son-in-law, Matthew Mainwaring, into whose possession a few copies of Ware's publication presumably had fallen, appears to have been dissatisfied with the position to which Ware had relegated Hanmer's *Chronicle*. In order to give greater prominence to the work of his father-in-law, he canceled Ware's title-page of the *Two His-*

tories and substituted for it another printed entirely in letterpress within a single-rule border. This reads:

The History of Ireland, by Three Learned Authors viz. Meredith Hanmer Doctor of Divinity: Edmund Campion sometime Fellow of S^t Johns College in Oxford: and Edmund Spencer Esq. Dublin, Printed for the Society of Stationers, Printers to the Kings Most Excellent Majestie, 1633.

Following the order of the names on the title-page, to which Mainwaring gives prominence according to their degrees, Hanmer's work, in some copies containing this title-page, is, in accordance with Mainwaring's design, placed before that of Campion. This was easy to do for, as we have already seen, it bore a distinct pagination, though, truth to say, the signature-marks, to the sophisticated, bear suspicious evidence of being of a secondary character.

The plausibility of this theory is further borne out by the fact that we find that Ware's dedication to Thomas, Lord Viscount Wentworth, is dropped in some copies with Mainwaring's title-page and a new one substituted therefor. This new dedication, also to Lord Wentworth, is subscribed "Your Honours faithfully obliged fervant Matthew Mainwaring." After the usual complimentary phrases, incident to the dedications of those days, he goes on to say:

Accept (*Right Honourable*) what the genius of the work itself offers, and my humble duty to your Lordship presents. In which action you shall not only magnifie your owne goodness, but also nobly befriend that piety, which I owe the deceased Author Doctor Hanmer, my never enough honoured father in law [perhaps a caustic

reference to Ware's treatment of Hanmer's work], from whom I inherit a care and kindred to this his issue.

A copy (perhaps unique) with the title-page, *The History of Ireland by Three Learned Authors*, etc., and Mainwaring's "Dedication" is in the University Library, Cambridge (press-mark, Hib. 4. 63. 6).

The bibliographical history of this somewhat complicated series of linked books appears, in view of the foregoing considerations, to be as follows:

a) *The Two Histories of Ireland* containing the works of Campion and Hanmer; the latter linked to the former by mention on the title-page.

b) Spenser's *View of Ireland*, without the four leaves of "Annotations" subsequently added as an after-thought as is evidenced by the signature-mark of the sheet upon which they were printed, a minuscule letter "k" and without the words Whereunto is added, etc., subsequently added to the title. Of Spenser's *View* this then appears to be the *First Issue*.

c) Spenser's *View*, with the sheet of "Annotations"; but still without the words "Whereunto is added, etc." This constitutes the *Second Issue* of the work.

d) Spenser's *View* with the words "Whereunto is added, etc.," appended to the title, but without the "Annotations." This, then, is the *Third Issue*. We would naturally expect to find copies with this title bound before the volume containing the works of Campion and Hanmer; but few copies are really so bound.

e) Spenser's *View* with the words "Whereunto is added, etc.," and with the "Annotations," this being the *Fourth Issue*.

f) Copies with the title *The History of Ireland by Three Learned Authors* and with Mainwaring's "Dedication," which, as we have already seen, appears to have been brought out by Mainwaring to

counteract the lack of prominence or slight he thought had been given the work of Hammer, his father-in-law, by Ware.

Copies differently bound from those here described may occur but are probably so bound through the misapprehension of the owner or binder as to the correct order in which they should be placed.

The Bradshaw Collection of Irish Books in the University Library, Cambridge, contains seven copies, probably the most extensive collection of these works anywhere to be found.

The Huntington Library bought from a bookseller's catalogue a volume entitled *A Collection of Some Principal Rules and Maximes of the Common Lawes of England, etc.*, by Sir Francis Bacon, London, 1636. When this little quarto volume was received there was nothing about it to excite suspicion, for when collated it bore every evidence of having been published separately. It was found to have a regular series of signature-marks, page numbers, and the last page closed with the word "Finis." Had it indeed been published separately the collation would no doubt have read as follows: [A], four leaves (the first, probably blank, lacking), B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, K, L, M, N, O, each four leaves (the last, probably blank, lacking); total fifty-six leaves.

It was quickly discovered, however, on comparing it with another volume in the Library, that the first leaf of sheet [A] instead of being blank, as was at first supposed, should contain a collective title-page, reading: "The Ele-

ments of the Common Lawes of England, Branched into a double Tract: the One Containing a Collection of some principall Rules and Maximes of the Common Law, . . . The other The Use of the Common Law, etc., by the late Sir Francis Bacon, London, 1636"; and that the last leaf instead of being blank, as surmised, should contain the title-page of the Second Tract, "The Vse of the Law ... by the Lord Verulam Viscount of S. Albons, &c." London, 1635, the second tract called for by the collective title-page.

We have here a case of a linked book, separately bound, to all appearances being as originally issued. Had the Huntington Library not had a copy containing both tracts with the collective and secondary title-pages, there is no telling how long it might have rested upon its shelves before it was detected to be sailing under false colors.

How many other books are similarly passing as separate publications we have no means of knowing, but, as here shown, there is a possibility that there may be many such. This example proves conclusively that no pains should be spared to ascertain by comparison with copies known to be perfect whether all of the preliminary or end leaves necessary to complete a volume are really blank or contain printed matter.

From what precedes it will be seen that linked books form a class by themselves and are the *bête noire* of bibliographers.

COTTON MATHER AND HIS WRITINGS ON WITCHCRAFT

BY THOMAS J. HOLMES

Librarian, William G. Mather's Library, Cleveland, Ohio

COTTON MATHER'S entrance into the world's annals of witchcraft, in the character in which some of our historians have portrayed him, did not come about primarily through his two major works on that subject nor through the relative importance of his witchcraft writings as compared with his other works. It came about through that inconsiderable manuscript of his concerning the comparatively insignificant "witchcraft" case of Margaret Rule, and by his contact over it with Robert Calef.

Mather opponents have tuned their fiddles to Calef's key. Many a tune have they fiddled, out of harmony with truth, respecting Cotton Mather and the witch tragedies at Salem in 1692. It therefore may not be amiss to contribute our little aid toward the correction, if that is possible, of two minor strains among those errors.

First, I would invite you to a very brief survey of Mather's works, to effect a comparison of the whole of them with that portion of his writings devoted to the subject of witchcraft. Second, I hope to indicate evidence tending to show that, however the reaction from the witch frenzy first manifested itself, whatever were the immediate causes, the nature and extent of that reaction, which came all too slowly and too timidly—the development of which

no one to this day has quite fully delineated—that reaction, did *not* involve Cotton Mather in any serious loss of public following, or in any serious diminution of his personal prestige. The contrary of this has been many times reiterated, as by W. R. Bliss, *Side glimpses from the Colonial meeting house* (Boston, 1894), page 199.

Before writing his trifle of a paper on Margaret Rule, Cotton Mather, then thirty years old, had published approximately 38 separate works. After it, and before he ceased his labor at the age of sixty-five, he published at least 399 more. A total of no less than 437 published works are to his credit, exclusive of reprints, prefaces, and unprinted manuscripts. The editors of the *Cambridge History of American Literature*, by including posthumous works, prefaces, etc., have compiled a list of 475 items. These probably could still be augmented.

Without attempting the difficult task of an exhaustive classification of these at this time, a hasty examination shows that among them are works on the following subjects:

For the popular light reading of the day, funeral sermons take the lead with fifty-one examples. Sixteen works deal with various aspects of New England history. On medicine there are ten, five of which are on small-pox, exclusive of three contributed papers and one circulated MS on that subject. There were ten biographies, five issued singly and five in one work. Of these there were eight reprinted in the *Magnalia*, which contains over sixty biographies as well as a large number of short memoirs. At

least four works were devoted to psalms, hymns, singing. There were two elegies.

On each of the following themes he wrote one, two, or on some subjects three books: pirates, captives, criminals, thieves, impostors, evil customs, murder, drinking, taverns, dancing, cursing, anger, idolatry, hypocrisy, slothfulness, slander, the ark, the tabernacle, sacrifices, adversity, prosperity, fifth of November, new year, winter, summer heat, change, time, heavenly world, terrors of hell, natural science, Sabbath-keeping, antinomianism, arianism, quakerism, rules for right living, civic affairs, society to suppress disorders, commerce and trading, debtor and creditor, fidelity in engagements, masters, servants, parents, children, widows, orphans, youth, catechisms, oaths, calamitous fires, earthquakes, storms, rainbow, aurora borealis. No subject of possible interest in his day escaped his attention.

Books were especially addressed to farmers, soldiers, sailors, fishermen, negroes, Indians.

A great many of these works, though not all, were originally sermons, containing a good mixture of homily and theology. They were printed in small books varying from about twenty-four to one hundred and eight pages each. Some of the sermons were printed by request of some of the auditory. Some of the issues were simply tracts; though others were considerable works of two to three hundred pages, a few of which retain interest and value even to this day. Among such are his *Manuductio ad ministerium*, *directions for a candidate of the ministry*, and his

Ratio disciplinae, a faithful account of the discipline professed and practised in the churches of New England. His *Christian philosopher, a collection of the best discoveries in nature with religious improvements* still has its usefulness in the history of science. The works just mentioned, though less known, are probably in some ways superior to the *Magnalia*, by which Mather's name is still best known in literature.

His works were in great measure the reflection of passing events, and the moods of that public of which Cotton Mather was popular preacher, writer, and idol. The works are not only formidably numerous but the originals are now rare and widely scattered. Some titles exist only in a single copy still remaining, so that their perusal is attended with no little difficulty. Therefore I have not minutely examined the entire contents of all of his works but have judged some of them by photographs of their title-pages only. I do not assume any dogmatic bellicose attitude in regard to my conclusions. The witch trials have already resulted in the fruitless shedding of much ink.

So far, then, I might say I have found that on witchcraft Mather published two complete works only, three chapters or portions of other works, and the text of a letter of advice to the governor. He probably also supervised the compilation and aided in the publication of one other complete work written in his defense. In addition to publishing these, he wrote on this subject five letters and three manuscripts that he did not publish, and the text of an unpublished proclamation. The list is given at the end of

this paper, and comprises a total of 16 items on witchcraft as against over 475 on all subjects.

I think it is safe to say that if Cotton Mather had been the active, interested, conscious promoter of the persecutions that some historians seem to have thought and others still think he was, there should have been a much larger deposit from that sort of mental activity seen in his writings than the remains of his work now show.

In the twelve years from 1688 to 1700, during which the subject of witchcraft is commonly supposed to have eaten up Mather's mind almost completely, he wrote on other subjects than witchcraft a total of eighty-eight works.

During the four years from about the autumn of 1693 to that of 1697, in which Robert Calef and his several aids were engaged in distracting Mather with their activities and in concocting their book, *More wonders of the invisible world*, the harried one published twenty-six works, and did much toward preparing for the press his largest, his best-known, and still useful work, the *Magnalia*.

In the five years or a little more immediately preceding this period, occurred those two chief groups of witchcraft cases that Mather recorded in his two books on the subject, and the books themselves were written and printed within this span of years. Yet we may safely assign to this period not less than thirty publications on other subjects; among them the *Life of John Eliot*, afterward four times reprinted.

Nor should it be forgotten that these five years em-

braced the greater part of the intercharter period, the revolution, and the two expeditions—one that gained Port Royal and the other that failed against Quebec and caused Sir William Phips, who led them, to seek aid in London.¹ It was a time of nerve-racking anxiety for all public men in the colony; which, in a triple sense, affected Cotton Mather. He was concerned about his father, then in London working for the charter. Upon him also rested added responsibilities and work of the North Church by reason of the father's absence.

That he carried his share, too, of the general public anxiety, and aided to some extent in the Revolution when the people took arms against Andros, is shown by the fact that it was he who wrote the rousing *Declaration of the Gentlemen Merchants and Inhabitants of Boston and Country adjacent*, which was read on April 18, 1689, from the gallery of the council-chamber to a "vast concourse of people." This *Declaration* gave voice to the provisional government, and justified the arrest of Andros and his minions.²

If we can obtain a correct impression of Cotton Mather during the development and passing of the witchcraft craze, busy on his pastoral visits, preaching his sermons in Boston and occasionally in adjacent towns and villages, conducting private meetings, and, in his turn, Thursday lectures, keeping fasts even to the endangering of his health, engaging in omnivorous reading and in the writing

¹ Palfrey, IV, 49-59.

² Neal, *History of New England*, pp. 430-42; Palfrey, III, 579.

of his many books,¹ and never once attending any of the witchcraft trials, we cannot but conclude that he gave comparatively little of his mind and time to the subject of witchcraft, and that it interested him far, far less than is usually supposed.

Then later, during the reaction from the witchcraft persecutions, when "Calef and the Brattles . . . seized Mather by the throat," as Brooks Adams expressed it, and when Leverett, the Brattles, Coleman, and the young liberals were working against him at Harvard and elsewhere, and the diaries on various accounts were recording those humiliations before the Lord that nearly two centuries later were to be so helpful to the traducers of his good name,² how did Mather during those years stand with his public? After the witch trials and during the Margaret Rule affair was "public opinion . . . arrayed solidly against him," as James T. Adams³ says it was? Let us see.

It has been usual to enlarge gleefully on Mather's quarrel with Governor Dudley, and on the loss by Increase Mather of the presidency of Harvard after the council order of 1701 required the president to live at Cambridge, and on the closing of the door to that office also against Cotton Mather. It has been usual to enlarge on these points, and to fortify them with confessions of disappointment from Mather's diaries and fulminations from his let-

¹ See *Diary*, I, 147, and B. Wendell, *Cotton Mather*, pp. 79-87.

² E.g., W. R. Bliss, *Side Glimpses*, pp. 199-203, and Upham, *Salem Witchcraft*, II, 503-5.

³ *Founding of New England*, p. 455.

ters, in order to prove Mather's loss of public esteem. It is true that Cotton Mather was denied complete fulfilment of some of his ambitions, spiritual as well as temporal. He strove for that which in the changing times, perhaps even at any time, was unattainable.

In his personal inner life—and that must be noticed in the case of a man of Cotton Mather's type—in his inner life, he sought to realize and to perpetuate that mystical ecstasy which is possible for human beings to know if at all only in brief trances.¹ The reaction from such efforts, like those of the saints of old, was a sense of sin, of great personal imperfection, which found its expression in utter self-abasement in many an overwrought passage in the diaries²—passages that too often have been misread and misused by the enemies of his good name.

In a temporal and outward sense, his success in life was not always and in all places as great as were his hopes—a common-enough human experience that should not have been counted against him as it has been. His disappointment reacted in many a hasty word and in more than one undignified letter that has since told to his disadvantage. He experienced rebuffs, and, in common with the best of men, met an occasional defeat, but that he suffered no great failure, no serious loss of public esteem, I hope to show presently.

Cotton Mather was not a traveled man. He probably

¹ *Diary*, I, 5-11, 187, 192-93, 254-55, 477-79; C. A. Bennett, *Philosophical Study of Mysticism*, pp. 10, 47, 48, etc.; B. Wendell, *op. cit.*, p. 304.

² *Diary*, I, 479.

never ventured from his native Boston farther, perhaps, than New Haven. His views might pardonably be provincial. His father had stood before kings and had nominated William Phips to be the first royal governor under the new charter. Such a son, who had in addition intimately consulted with God, the King of Kings, might easily make the mistake of offering advice or even reproof to Joseph Dudley, a mere governor of Massachusetts, whose very appointment was in some measure due to Mather's earlier and at that time friendly influence. Especially was Cotton Mather, the born teacher, liable to such error when the inner root and motive of the quarrel with Dudley concerned the government, not of Massachusetts, but of Harvard College.

Cotton Mather had no talents for diplomacy and skilful scheming. In his tilts with the self-seeking, intriguing, worldly wise Dudley he was worsted. But there was perhaps a more subtle force than Dudley working against the Mathers, father and son. It was the implacable Elisha Cooke, protagonist of the lost old charter and foe of the new charter that had been secured by the elder Mather's agency.

Then there were young men among the overseers of Harvard who held views about the Lord's Supper and church administration that were less strict than those taught by the early Fathers and held by the Mathers. The Mathers would prevent the sowing of what they thought was the seed of pernicious doctrine in the young minds at Harvard; but the temper of the times being less

strict than at an earlier day, fostered perhaps by the liberal conditions under the new charter, seemed to favor the new ideas enough to give them a trial.

But these changes were fruiting after 1700—over seven years after the events of Salem. The changes were at heart almost wholly political in character. Even the ecclesiastical changes had their political aspects. They had nothing to do with the reaction from the witch frenzy, and they had apparently no great bearing on the personal popularity of either teacher Increase, or pastor Cotton Mather.

This paper concerns Cotton Mather. If Harvard, then, was lost to him, as he himself finally saw, was his public lost to him? Fortunately on this there exists unbiased, trustworthy evidence, that of experts in measuring public esteem, those who convert that esteem into cold unsentimental business. If Mather fell from public favor, the fall would be instantly reflected in loss of demand for his publications. If his public deserted him, his publishers—in spite of financial help on special occasion from father-in-law Phillips or friends like Thomas Bradbury and John Winthrop or his own ample purchases and his solicited subscriptions—if his public deserted him, his publishers must, by inexorable necessity, very speedily follow. To undertake the publication of even one book in those days of limited capital was a matter of consideration for the publisher. If composition by hand was relatively cheaper then than it is today, type, paper, ink, and press-work were expensive. Real money must come in from one book, or be fairly assured, before the next could be undertaken.

No author's works can be sold to, or successfully unloaded, in any period by any ruse, device, or stratagem known to the publishing craft, by title after title during year after year, upon a public that is arrayed solidly against him. A publisher's business thrives solely upon the popularity of his authors.

To judge how busy, impetuous, witty, outwardly cheerful though often inwardly despondent, generous, loquacious, pedantic, egoistic, yet in many ways adaptable and tolerant and withal mystical, Cotton Mather stood in his day with his public it should be necessary only to glance briefly at his published titles.

To afford a rapid survey, the following summary is grouped in five-year periods:

From 1682 to 1686, he published 4 titles

From 1687 to 1691, he published 23 new titles

From 1692 to 1696, he published 26 new titles

From 1697 to 1701, he published 51 new titles

From 1702 to 1706, he published 60 new titles

From 1707 to 1711, he published 46 new titles

From 1712 to 1716, he published 77 new titles

From 1717 to 1721, he published 68 new titles

From 1722 to 1726, he published 66 new titles

In 1727 and 1728, he published 16 new titles

Many of these works, first printed in Boston, were reprinted in London; some of them were reprinted more than once. *Ornaments for the daughters of Zion* had six editions, as also had his *Monitor for communicants*. The *Family religion excited* appeared at least seven or eight times. His *Essays to do good*, which proved helpful even to the

practical-minded Benjamin Franklin, though not reprinted in Mather's lifetime, had eighteen editions, three of them published over a century after the author's death, two editions appearing as late as 1842 (London) and 1845 (Boston).

This unbroken cataract of new publications pouring forth to the last of Mather's days shows no diminution during the reaction from the witchcraft episode, no indications of serious defections of patronage contemporary with the liberal movement centered about Coleman and the Brattles from 1700 onward, no indications of a stampede from the ranks of his readers at any time. Whatever were the political or ecclesiastical developments of his time, whatever enemies he may have had—and who is without these?—we might even say whatever were his views over or connections with the witch persecutions, Cotton Mather, if continued avidity for his writings indicates anything, carried his great personal popularity during the whole of his life. How great that popularity was, may be conjectured from Increase Mather's statement¹ that ordinarily fifteen hundred persons attended services in their church. If this is not acceptable as a proof of popularity, it could be confirmed in several other ways; perhaps most readily by Mather's *Diary*,² if we care to accept that authority when quoted in his favor as it has been so often cited against him:

On Monday, September 5, 1698, he journeyed to Salem;

¹ Letter to Stoughton (December 16, 1698), in Sewall, *Diary*, I, 493.

² I, 272-73.

on the next day, with a council of five churches, he went to Chebacco (i.e., Ipswich), where, on the day following, the council sat and rendered decision on a case before it. Thursday he "preached the Lecture at Ipswich." On Friday he returned to Salem, where on the following Sunday he preached in both the forenoon and afternoon, with a sense of great success. This in Salem, the center, six years earlier, of those tragedies and terrors by which the town had "lost, in one year, a quarter of its whole population."¹

Upon his return to Boston after his few days' sojourn in Salem and in Ipswich, Mather records the following impression:

Finding that whenever I go abroad, the *Curiosity* and *Vanity* of the people discovers itself, in their *great Flocking* to hear mee; with no little Expectation; it still causes mee aforehand, exceedingly to *humble* myself before the Lord. . . . By this Method, I not only am in a comfortable measure kept from the foolish *Taste* of *popular Applause* in my own Heart, but also from the humbling Dispensations of Heaven, whereunto the Fondness of the People might otherwise expose mee.

It probably is no exaggeration to say that Cotton Mather as an entertainer was the seventeenth-century New England prototype of the present-day *matinée* idol. Granted that the compliments he received made him vain, may not a little vanity be allowed him as a professional perquisite?

The favorable view of Cotton Mather's character entertained by the public of his time did not die with him.

¹ Bentley, *Description of Salem*, p. 234, in *M.H.S. Coll.*, Vol. VI.

"A fragrant memory of him remains to this day," said his biographer, Marvin (p. 218), and adds: "Among the many eulogies of Cotton Mather no immortelle cast upon his grave was sweeter or brighter than that of Benjamin Colman."

Even concerning the witchcraft frenzy, there are not wanting in earlier and in recent times studiously and carefully written accounts, having the cogency of truth, that exhibit sympathetic views of Mather's relation to the events of 1692; or in which his responsibility is held to have been of very minor importance. Among such accounts are those of John Fiske, *New France and New England*; E. B. Andrews, *History of the United States*, Volume I; D. Neal, *History of New-England*, chapter xii; W. F. Poole, *Salem Witchcraft*; W. S. Nevins, *Witchcraft in Salem Village*; A. P. Marvin, *Cotton Mather*; and B. Wendell, *Cotton Mather*. The most recent and perhaps most comprehensive discussion of the relationship of the Mathers, Cotton and Increase, to Salem witchcraft, however, is in K. B. Murdock, *Life and Work of Increase Mather*, chapter xvii, a doctoral thesis (1923) published by the Harvard University Press.

It will be seen, then, that concerning the historical figure of Cotton Mather there have flowed across two centuries of his country's literature two utterly divergent streams of criticism; and it is not easy for the average reader, or even the busy writer of history, to decide which contains the water of truth and which the mud of error.

One of Mather's biographers, W. B. O. Peabody (1836), confessed:

It is very difficult to form a satisfactory estimate of a character like Cotton Mather's which abounds in contradictions; to tell the precise amount of blame due to his faults, which were many, and how heavily they should weigh against the credit due his virtues [p. 345].

Peabody's quandary indicates how thoroughly the old Puritan's character has been slandered—not always with wilful malice—and how early the aspersion began.

The adverse criticism in literature concerning Cotton Mather goes back through C. W. Upham and Francis Hutchinson, diminishing at each remove toward its source in Robert Calef's *More Wonders*. Though Calef's conclusions were drawn as much from his theories, which can be seriously questioned, as from his reports of local facts which are his best title to credibility, still his chief criticism concerning the Salem tragedies—throughout his letters and Preface, the only portions ascribable with certainty to his pen—was directed against the underlying doctrines, the "Heathenish notions" and "the Slavery of a corrupt Education" whence he believed the evils had sprung.

He traces these pernicious witchcraft doctrines back to Perkins, Gaul, and Bernard—writing in England since the Reformation. "The Doctrine of the power of Devils, and Witchcraft as it is now, and long has been understood" he finds among the "pernicious weeds" that came into the church from the "Fables of Homer, Virgil, Horace and Ovid &c."^{*}

Calef speaks of "the *received* Opinions about Witch-

^{*} Preface.

craft,"¹ which I take to mean the opinions commonly held by people around him whom he knew and saw and conversed with daily. This would indicate that the people, the public, of Calef's day, held to a very wide extent those opinions that he criticized. Palfrey says:

The people of Massachusetts in the seventeenth century, like all other Christian people at that time,—at least, with extremely rare individual exceptions,—believed in the reality of a hideous crime called witchcraft.²

Rev. William Bentley, D.D., Harvard, 1777, minister of the Second Church in Salem, 1783–1819, states:

Mr. Noyes . . . believed in witchcraft, and so did every other person. . . . The doctrine of invisible agency, no one was bold enough utterly to deny. . . . The Salem judges . . . were over ruled by the madness, which was universal around them.³

The necessary support of that dreadful tribunal, said Dr. George H. Moore, "had been in the madness of the people, the poisoned breath of the mob."⁴ A mob spirit that has left its definite trace in history in the plundering by the multitude of the home of Mr. Philip English after first his wife then he himself had been accused of witchcraft and arrested.⁵

C. W. Upham says: "The whole force of popular superstition, all the fanatical propensities of the ignorant and

¹ Pp. 64, 83. Italics mine.

² *Op. cit.*, IV, 96.

³ "Description and History of Salem," *Massachusetts Historical Society Collections*, VI, 266.

⁴ *Final Notes on Witchcraft in Massachusetts* (New York, 1885), p. 81.

⁵ Bentley, *Description of Salem*, p. 270.

deluded multitude, united with the best feelings of our nature to heighten the fury of the storm."¹

Then, after the storm was over, said Dr. Bentley, "Few dared to blame other men, because few were innocent. They who had been most active, remembered that they had been applauded."²

Against some features of those generally diffused, popular conceptions of witchcraft of his time, Calef, then, worked out his ideas, embodied them in what he called his "doctrinals,"³ and with these opposed the "received opinions" of his day. If we read Calef aright, he set himself to pillory the witchcraft beliefs, held generally by the intellectual leaders, the ministers and writers, the magistrates and judges, and the public of his time, that had made possible the blind fury of 1692.

Though heat was generated and personalities involved, as was certain to be in any clash with popular notions, and though Calef said Mather's "Strenuous and Zealous asserting his opinions, has been one cause of the dismal Convulsions,"⁴ he never regarded Mather as the singly responsible source.

It was during the nineteenth century that the idea gained force for holding Cotton Mather chiefly blamable for the Salem calamity of 1692—an idea that developed currency out of the strong bias of Upham's work as it re-

¹ *Salem Witchcraft*, II, 370-71.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 271.

³ *More Wonders* (1700), pp. 17, 18, 34, 42.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

lates to Cotton Mather, and that found ready reception in that critical, iconoclastic, realistic spirit of the nineteenth century that had very little sympathy with the ideals, very little patience with the faults, of the fervently religious, believing, seventeenth century—which in many ways Cotton Mather typified and represented.

In recapitulation, then, of the foregoing, I would submit for the consideration of any who may think it worth while, that Cotton Mather's works show that he was much less interested in witchcraft than is sometimes supposed, and that the time he is considered to have been giving to the study of that subject he was very strenuously devoting to quite different undertakings. Also I would submit that the statement occasionally repeated by Cotton Mather's opponents, that he was discredited by his public over and following the witch trials, cannot be true when the ever growing volume of his publications indicate an increasing popularity throughout the period of the witch trials, straight through the attacks by Calef and the differences with the liberals and with Dudley, and on down the years of his life.

With the fuller understanding of the underlying causes, character, and nature of the phenomena of witch persecutions in past ages¹—which persecutions, sad though they

¹ Professor George L. Kittredge has pointed the way to that understanding in his "Notes on Witchcraft," *Amer. Antiq. Soc. Proc.*, XVIII (N.S., 1907), especially in his summary in twenty-one brief theses of his conclusions (pp. 210-12). Professor George L. Burr made reply to this in his paper in *Amer. Antiq. Soc. Proc.*, Vol. XXI (N.S.). In connection with Professor Burr's paper should be read an earlier one by him, "The Literature of Witchcraft," *Papers of the Amer. Hist. Assoc.*, Vol. IV. See also Preface, introductions, and notes to his

were, were but one aspect of that universal woe and travail through which humanity has suffered and labored into partial enlightenment—and with a dispassionate examination of the original sources of the history of the New England outbreak, the present writer believes that those charges made against Cotton Mather concerning the originating and the promoting of the lamentable proceedings at Salem in 1692 will ultimately fall away. Then Mather will bear, in the work not only of some but of all future reputable writers of Massachusetts history, no more than his just small fractional share of indirect responsibility with the men of his time for the shortcomings of his community under the darkness of the age in which they lived.

COTTON MATHER'S WORKS AND LETTERS ON WITCHCRAFT

1. a) *Memorable providences relating to witchcrafts and possessions*. Boston: Richard Pierce, 1689.
- b) Reprinted under title, *Late memorable providences*, ed. by Richard Baxter. London, 1691.
- c) Reprinted under original title, Edinburgh, 1697.
- d) In part retold in *Magnalia*, Book VI, chap. vii.
- e) The preceding reprinted as part of the extracts from

Narratives of the Witchcraft Cases, New York, 1914. On the whole question, of course, see W. E. H. Lecky, *Rationalism*, chapter on "Magic and Witchcraft."

A new view of the question of witchcraft is set forth by Margaret Alice Murray, *The Witch-Cult in Western Europe*, Oxford, 1921. See also Ian Fergusson, *The Philosophy of Witchcraft*, New York, 1925.

Mather's account of Margaret Rule is discussed in "The Surreptitious Printing of one of Cotton Mather's Manuscripts," by Thomas J. Holmes, *Bibliographical Essays, A Tribute to Wilberforce Eames* (1924), pp. 149-60.

the witchcraft portions of the *Magnalia*, with the title: *Wonders of the invisible world*; issued as second part of reprint of Richard Baxter's *Certainty of the world of spirits*. London, 1834.

The title of this reprint is misleading; it is not a reprint of C. M.'s *Wonders*.

- f) Reprinted but with the omission of Example III, and the two discourses (separately paged at end of the original ed.) in George L. Burr, *Narratives of the witchcraft cases*. New York, 1914.
2. a) *The wonders of the invisible world*.
Two imprints: Boston: Benjamin Harris, 1693; and Boston: Benjamin Harris for Sam Phillips, 1693.
- b) Reprinted, two variations. London: John Dunton, 1693.
One variation has the errata of the Boston edition reprinted on p. 51 (N₂). In the second variation, this errata, useless for this edition, is removed and the space filled with publisher's note.
 - c) Reprinted, abridged, 2d ed. London: John Dunton, 1693.
 - d) Reprinted, same text as c, 3d ed. London: John Dunton, 1693.
 - e) Reprinted, with Calef's *More wonders*, from 3d London ed. Ed. by Samuel P. Fowler. Salem, 1861.
 - f) Reprinted from 1st London ed. b second variation; with Increase Mather's *Further account of the tryals*. London: John Russell Smith, 1862. In Library of old authors.
 - g) Reprinted on large paper, ed. of 1861. Boston, 1865.
 - h) Reprinted, ed. by Samuel G. Drake. Roxbury, Mass., 1866. Volume V in Woodward's "Historical series." From the first London ed. b second variation. Proof read with a.
 - i) Reprinted, ed. by George L. Burr in *Narratives of the witchcraft cases*. New York, 1914. Includes mainly the

introductory material, the Breviate of five of the Salem trials, and the four "Curiosities." Omits the discourses, and extracts from Perkins, Gaul, Bernard, Judge Hale, and Horneck.

3. *The return of several ministers consulted by His Excel'ency and the Honourable Council, upon the present witchcrafts in Salem Village; Boston, June 15, 1692*, which "Humble Advice," "twelve Ministers concurringly presented."

Three articles of it were first printed in the body of the text of item No. 2; article VI with omissions, and article VIII in full, in "Enchantments encountered" § V; and article II in paragraphs following "An hortatory and necessary address."

- a) Printed entire text in the Postscript of Increase Mather's *Cases of conscience concerning evil spirits*. Boston, 1693. It is framed in eight articles, sections, or paragraphs.
- b) Reprinted in same work with *A further account of the tryals of the New-England witches*. London, 1693.
- c) Again in this work, printed with C. M.'s *Wonders*. . . . London, 1862, item No. 2, f.
- d) Reprinted in *Pietas in patriam, Life of . . . Phips*, pp. 77-78, omitting articles I, II, and VIII. London, 1697.
- e) Again in this form in the *Magnalia*, Book II, P. 63 (London), 1702, and in reprints of that work.
- f) Reprinted in full in Thomas Hutchinson, *History . . . of Massachusetts-Bay*, Vol. II, chap. i. (2d ed.; London, 1768, pp. 50-51. 3d ed.; Boston, 1795, pp. 52-53.) Hutchinson omitted, probably accidentally, from article V the final words: "be consulted in such case"; and to make sense he substituted: "may be observed."
- g) Reprinted from f but with additional minor inaccuracies; "transactions" is printed instead of "transgressions" in

- article VII. Briefly and fairly annotated by Rowland H. Allen, in *New-England tragedies in prose*, Part II, "The Witchcraft Delusion," pp. 131-33. Boston: Nichols and Noyes, 1869.
- h) Again in full by W. F. Poole in "Cotton Mather and Salem witchcraft," *North American Review* (April, 1869), pp. 365-66.
 - i) Again in reprint of preceding, pp. 31-32. Boston, 1869.
 - j) Again in full in C. W. Upham, "Salem witchcraft and Cotton Mather," sec. VI, in *Historical Magazine*, September, 1869.
 - k) The preceding reissued in the separate with title, *Salem witchcraft and Cotton Mather. A reply*. Morrisania, N.Y., 1869.
 - l) Reprinted, with correct text, from Hutchinson's earlier MS draught of his "History of Massachusetts-Bay" in *Massachusetts Archives*, by W. F. Poole in *New-England historical & genealogical register*, XXIV (1870), 405-6.
 - m) Again, in separate reprint of preceding with title, *Witchcraft delusion of 1692 by Gov. Thomas Hutchinson . . . with notes by W. F. Poole* (Boston, private print, 1870), pp. 32-33.
 - n) Reprinted with omission of articles I and II by W.S. Nevins, *Witchcraft in Salem Village*, pp. 82-83. Boston, 1892.
 - o) Paraphrased, each article separately, by Enoch Pond in *Life of Sir William Phipps*, pp. 265-66. Boston, 1847.
 - p) Summarized in *More wonders*, Part V, p. 101, London, 1700, and in reprints of that work.
 - q) Reproduced in full by K. B. Murdock in his *Life and work of Increase Mather*, chap. xvii, n. 39. A doctoral thesis deposited in Harvard Library. Cambridge, 1923.

In his text and notes Dr. Murdock places this much-discussed document clearly in its true position and perspective in history. His work will shortly be published.

4. a) Sec. 16 in *Pietas in patriam, the life of . . . Sir William Phips*. London: Nath. Hiller, 1697. A brief sketch of the witchcraft outbreak in 1692.
b) Reprinted in *Magnalia*, Book II, sec. 16.

5. "Article XXVIII. Troubles from the invisible world," *Parentator, Memoirs of . . . Increase Mather*. Boston, 1724.

A brief outline of the witchcraft of 1692. "Wiser men than those Flashy and Fleering Witlings, who at a Distance think a *Scornful Scoff* to be Sufficient Solution for these things, had they been on the spot, could not but have been extremely *Puzzled* with them" (p. 164).

6. "Thaumatographia pneumatica," in *Magnalia*, Book VI, chap. vii. Relates fourteen examples; ninth is that of the Goodwin children retold from his *Memorable providences*, fourteenth is that of the Salem cases copied from MS of John Hale's *Modest enquiry*, afterward published. Boston, 1702.

7. Letter to the Honourable John Richards. Dated "Boston 3rd. 3m. [May] 1692."

Printed in "Mather Papers," *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, Series 4, Vol. VIII, pp. 391-97. John Richards was one of the witch-trial judges and a member of Mather's church.

8. Letter, "For the Honourable John Foster Esqr." Dated "17th 6m. [August] 1692."

- a) Printed in *Transactions of the Literary and Hist. Soc. of Quebec*, II, 313-16. Quebec, 1831.

John Foster was at date of this letter a member of the council and a member of Mather's church.

- b) Reprinted by C. W. Upham in his *Salem witchcraft and Cotton Mather*, in *Historical Magazine* (September, 1869), chap. x, pp. 167-68.

- c) Again in the preceding work reissued as a separate publi-

cation, with similar title, pp. 39-40. Morrisania, New York, 1869.

9. Letter to Stephen Sewall; dated "Boston Sep. 20, 1692."
 - a) Printed by C. W. Upham in Appendix A to 2d ed., *Lectures on witchcraft*. Boston, 1832.
 - b) Reprinted in C. W. Upham, *Salem witchcraft*, II, 487-88. Boston, 1867.
 - c) Reprinted by C. W. Upham in his *Salem witchcraft and Cotton Mather*, in *Historical Magazine* (September, 1869), chap. xi, p. 172.
 - d) Reprinted in *New Eng. hist. and geneal. register* (1870), pp. 107-8.

10. Letter mentioned by Robert Calef, *More wonders*, p. 16, as "that long Letter only once read to me."

Apparently this was read by messenger to Calef in answer to his first letter to Mather, dated "Sep. 29, 1693." So far as I know, this letter has not yet been found.

11. Letter to Robert Calef, dated "Jan. 15, 1693-4," inclosed with which were the three attestations of six witnesses to Margaret Rule's spiritualistic levitation.

a) Printed in *More wonders*, Part II, pp. 19-23. London, 1700. Again in reprints of that work. Included in G. L. Burr, *Narratives*. . . .

12. MS: "A brand pluck'd out of the burning."

A cover-page bears the inscription, by a later hand: "Brand Plucked out of the Burning, being an Account of Mercy Short who was supposed to suffer by Witchcraft 1692." In his own hand is written "To bee return'd unto Cotton Mather."

a) The MS. is in possession of the Amer. Antiq. Society. It is summarized in J. G. Palfrey, *History of New England*, IV, 114-15 n.

- b) Printed in full with notes by George L. Burr in *Narratives of the witchcraft cases*, pp. 255-87. New York, 1914.
13. MS: "Another brand pluckt out of the burning, or, more wonders of the invisible world."
- a) An account of "The afflictions of Margaret Rule" printed by Robert Calef as Part I of his *More wonders of the invisible world*. London, 1700. Again in reprints of that work. Included in G. L. Burr, *Narratives*. . . .
14. MS: Papers on witchcraft sent to Calef, but for him "to return them in a Fortnight, and not copied."
- a) The MS is in the Massachusetts Historical Society Library.
- Calef summarized these in his letter to Mr. B [rattle], March 1, 1694-95, *More wonders*, p. 30, and again in his letter to the ministers, March 18, 1694-95, pp. 34-35 (ed. 1700). He annotated the margins of the document and returned it by the hand of Mr. B., from whom he had received it.
- b) Papers were identified by Worthington C. Ford, and printed by him in full with Calef's *marginalia* in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.* (1913-14), pp. 240-68.
15. MS: Proclamation for fast, rejected by the Council.
- a) The MS is in *Mass. Archives*, XI, 119. It is a "Declaration enumerating Sundry Evills to be confessed on a Publick Day of Humiliation therein proposed." It was read in the House of Representatives, Dec. 10, 1696, a first and second time, voted and sent up for concurrence. Read in Council December 11, and voted a non-concurrence.
- b) *Council Records*, VI, 502.
- c) Printed by George H. Moore in "Notes on history of witchcraft in Massachusetts," *Amer. Antiq. Soc. Proc.*, II (1882, N.S.), 174-75; and in the separate, Worcester, 1883, pp. 15-17.

- d) Again in *Acts and resolves* *Mass. Bay*, Vol. VII of reprint, Boston, 1892, pp. 532-33 nn.
- e) Again in W. D. Love, *Fast and thanksgiving days of New England*, pp. 266-68. Boston, 1895.
- f) Cotton Mather's own text of the "Articles of Confession," *Diary*, I, 214-16. Possibly from an earlier draught than *a*.
- g) George H. Moore, "Bibliographical notes on witchcraft in Massachusetts," *Amer. Antiq. Soc. Proc.*, V (April, 1888), 263, and in the separate, Worcester, 1888, p. 22, printed the paragraph referring directly to witchcraft in *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, *e* draught.
- h) W. R. Bliss, *Side glimpses from the Colonial meeting house* (Boston, 1894), p. 191, contains only the paragraph in *g*.
- i) Justin Winsor, "Literature of witchcraft in New England," *Amer. Antiq. Soc. Proc.* (October, 1895), and in the separate, p. 19. Worcester, 1896. Contains the same paragraph as *g*, which is as follows:

"Wicked *Sorceries* have been practised in the Land; and, in the Late Inexplicable storms from the *Invisible world* thereby brought upon us, wee were left, by the Just Hand of Heaven, unto those Errors, whereby Great Hardships were brought upon Innocent persons, and (wee fear) Guilt incurr'd, which we have all cause to Bewayl with much confusion of o^r face before the Lord."

The draught as printed in *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, *e* consists of twenty-three paragraphs containing one introductory paragraph, eighteen articles of confession, and four closing paragraphs. *f* contains two articles of confession omitted from *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, *e* and consists of twenty articles of confession only, omitting the introductory and the four closing paragraphs.

The order of arrangement of the articles in the diary is different from that of the finished text in *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, *e*.

There are also minor verbal differences, due possibly to Mather's own changes made during transcription.

The House, however, added a "streamer" to the article referring to magistrates and ministers, which in part read: "Neglects in the Administration of Justice impartially and duely in Courts of Justice is too Obvious in this Land."

This reflection on the integrity of the courts gave offense to the Council, some members of which were also members of the judicature, and seems to have been the main cause for rejection of the draught. Another cause was the objection by the governor and Council against what they felt was a usurpation of their prerogative in that the motion for the proclamation originated with the House of Representatives and not with the governor and Council.

See Sewall, *Diary*, I, 439-40; Mather, *Diary*, I, 211, 214-16. The draught adopted was written by Sewall and is printed in *Acts and Resolves* (1696), chap. 54, and in Sewall, *Diary*, I, 440, *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.* (5th series), Vol. V.

16. *Some few remarks upon a scandalous book, against the government and ministry of New England written by one Robert Calef. . . . Composed and published by several persons belonging to the flock of some of the injured pastors, and concerned for their just vindication. Truth will come off conqueror.* Boston, N.E. Printed by T. Green, sold by Nicholas Boone, 1701. Copies, BPL, Harv., MHS, Newb., NYPL.

C. M.'s *Diary*, I, 383-84, states, seven of the brethren who composed this work "were by the rest pitch'd upon to sett their names unto it." These were Obadiah Gill, John Barnard, John Goodwin, William Robie, Timothy Wadsworth, Robert Cumbey, George Robinson. The first two

were deacons in Mather's church. The third was father of the witchcraft children of 1688.

The work includes a lengthy letter (pp. 34-59) written and signed by Cotton Mather apparently at the request of the compilers, and a postscript (pp. 67-71) written by him and signed: "Jan. 9th 1700-1 Increase Mather, Cotton Mather." The NYPL copy has a MS note on p. 67: "I have this Postscript in Mr. Cotton Mather's own Handwriting. T. Prince."

APPENDIX

NOTE.—It might be well to append to foregoing list fragments or passages from the *Diary* which deal with witchcraft or with Calef; and extracts on witchcraft from works dealing with other themes. These fragments and extracts are as follows:

- A. a) Extract from *A midnight cry*. . . . Boston: John Allen for S. Phillips, 1692.

" 'Tis well known, that the *Devils* make a Compact with some *Witches*, to be Masters of their *Souls* upon their Departure hence; and such *Witches* have been among ourselves Convicted by so fair and full a process of *Law*, as would render the Denyers thereof worthy of no Reasonabler Company than that in Bethlem." (p. 10).

Copies, AAS-imp., JCB, WGM.

The sermon was preached April 10, 1692, and sent to press next day to print, for the sake of the covenant at the end, a small edition for members of his own church only. " 'Tis Published, but scarce made Publick."

- b) Extract quoted in note to C.M.'s *Diary*, I, 157.
- B. Extract from sermon before the General Assembly, November 3, 1709.
- a) The sermon was: *Theopolis Americana. An essay on the golden street*. . . Boston: B. Green, sold by S. Gerrish, 1710. Copies, AAS, BA, BM, Bod, Harv, MHS, NYHS, NYPL.

- b*) Quoted by C. W. Upham, "Salem witchcraft and Cotton Mather," *Historical Magazine* (1869), p. 196, and in the separate, p. 68.
 - c*) Again by George H. Moore in "Notes on the history of witchcraft in Massachusetts," *Amer. Antiq. Soc. Proc.*, October 21, 1882; and in the separate, Worcester, 1883, p. 24.
 - d*) Again by W. R. Bliss in *Side glimpses* . . . (Boston, 1894), pp. 200-201.
- C. Pages touching upon witchcraft or possession: *Diary*, I, pp. 114 (?), 147, 150-61, 164, 171-73, 175, 178-79, 211, 214-16. Pages on which occur references connected with Robert Calef: *ibid.*, pp. 172, 264-65, 371-74, 377, 379-80, 383-84, 393, 396-97.

MEETING AT CHICAGO, JANUARY 21, 1924

The Society met at the Hotel Sherman, Chicago, on New Year's Day, 1924. President A. S. Root presided, and William W. Bishop served as secretary pro tempore.

Mr. H. H. B. Meyer, of the Library of Congress, read a paper by Mr. Yale O. Millington, chief of the Periodical Division of the Library of Congress, "Newspapers in the District of Columbia, 1820-1850." President Root outlined a plan for a series of such papers to cover all the states of the Union. He had asked Mr. Millington to prepare this account of the newspapers of the District of Columbia from 1820 to 1850 as an example of method. There is no printed bibliography of newspapers covering the country as a whole for this period. Mr. Millington in his paper, and various members of the Society in the discussion which followed, called attention to the need of a bibliography of this sort, to the value of such a list, and to the difficulties of the task both general and particular. Mr. Millington based his bibliography on the newspaper collections of the Library of Congress, and particularly on its files of the *National Intelligencer* and other papers issued in Washington. His bibliography lists 93 papers, and is probably a very complete list of newspapers published in the District of Columbia in the period covered. The discussion was participated in by Mr. Henry, of the University of Chicago; Mr. Utley, of the Newberry Library; Mr. Ranck, of Grand Rapids; Mr. Meyer; and Mr. Bishop. The discussion was concerned chiefly with details of Mr. Millington's plan of work. The general scheme outlined by President Root was heartily commended. It was pointed out that certain of the larger states would probably have to be treated by districts and cities.

Captain Elbridge Colby, of Washington, D.C., had prepared a paper on "Bibliography as an Aid to Biography." This paper

was read by Mr. Henry, of the University of Chicago. Captain Colby's thesis that bibliography is the firmest foundation for literary biography was illustrated by a series of interesting problems from the life and works of Thomas Holcroft. Captain Colby questioned certain claims as to translations from both French and German made by that prolific writer in various publications.

Mr. J. B. Childs, of the John Crerar Library, submitted an outline of his list of bibliographical descriptions of sixteenth-century books, and set forth the problem of discovering adequate records and descriptions of books published in the sixteenth century from the literature that now exists. His bibliography, which will be published in full later, covers the older and better-known books and a large number of obscure and minor publications, principally histories of printing in various states and districts. The paper brought out a lively discussion emphasizing the want of any adequate bibliography of books used in European countries during the sixteenth century, and calling attention to the extreme difficulty of the task, in part at least due to the extraordinarily large mass of pamphlet material called forth by the Reformation and the Counter Reformation controversies.

Mr. Root described four different issues of the 1860 edition of the *Lincoln-Douglas Debates*, beginning his informal talk with a quotation from Mr. Madan on the "duplicity of duplicates," and instancing the eighteen different facsimiles of the *Ulster County Gazette* as a typical illustration of what may happen in reprinting. Mr. Root described minutely the four different issues of 1860 of the *Debates*, noting their similarities and their differences, and going into the history of the various issues to determine their priority. He concluded by a caution against any hasty branding of books as duplicates without detailed and careful examination on the part of competent people.

President Root read to the meeting his letter to the Council of the Bibliographical Society in the matter of a contribution to Konrad Haebler toward the publishing of a bibliographical work

which he has in progress. As the Council had ruled that the publication fund of the Bibliographical Society could not be used for this purpose, it was voted to appoint a committee to raise a fund by contributions.

WM. W. BISHOP, *Secretary pro tempore*

MEETING AT SARATOGA SPRINGS JULY, 1924

The Bibliographical Society met in the Casino at Saratoga Springs July 4 at 2:30 P.M. The program was unusually varied and interesting, and the attendance of over eighty was larger than usual. Professor A. S. Root, of Oberlin, was in the chair.

The first paper was by Mr. Frank H. Schechter, of New York City, on "Printers' Devices." Mr. Schechter is a lawyer and became interested in the subject in connection with legal rights. The modern trade-mark is a symbol of legal good-will, and is an asset; the medieval trade-mark was regulatory and distinctly a liability. Discussing this point somewhat more fully, Mr. Schechter then turned to printers' devices and found that they differed decidedly from the trade-marks, for they were optional, not compulsory, were variable, were not limited in number, and were symbols of self-expression, decorative rather than regulatory. Upon these points the subject was developed, from the first device in 1457, through the relations with colophons, including the printers of different countries, especially England, and up to the time when the English law took notice of them, first by Star Chamber decree in 1586, and then by statute in 1662.

Mr. Frank E. Robbins, of Ann Arbor, had a delightful paper on "Pickwickian Chronology." It was evident that Mr. Pickwick was well known to the audience, but apparently no one had noticed the chronological discrepancies that Mr. Robbins had investigated by aid of the calendar and consistent checking up of the book.

Mr. Thomas J. Holmes, of Cleveland, developed a thesis on "Cotton Mather and His Writings on Witchcraft." Taking the four hundred and seventy-five items listed under Cotton Mather, he found they were on all sorts of subjects, including funeral sermons, medicine, biographies, etc. Only two full works, and enough chapters, prefaces, etc., to make up sixteen were on witchcraft. During the witchcraft years he published thirty items on other subjects. Also, as there was need of a supporting public to publish books at that time, the list of publications indicates no diminution of support or discrediting by the public as several authors have said, including a recent one who writes: "Public opinion was solidly against him."

Mr. Louis H. Fox, of the New York Public Library, presented the second of the papers arranged for by Professor Root for the Society on the newspapers of the period 1820-50, the first on "The District of Columbia Newspapers" having been presented at the Chicago, 1923, meeting. Mr. Fox's list is not yet completed, but he indicated some of the interest aroused in him in the development of the subject, the use that will be made of such bibliographies, the present interest in newspaper subjects, and then he discussed the form of the list, discussing the *Evening Post* for a sample.

Mr. S. Y. Li, now working in the Chinese collection of the Library of Congress, gave a very unusual and interesting paper on "Chinese Bibliography." He said there was a vast amount of material in China which must be assembled according to Western methods. Mr. Li emphasized that his paper was on Chinese books on the subject, not a bibliography on China. He treated first the history of Chinese bibliographies from 600 B.C. Of these, this summary will mention only one or two—the Ss K'u early Christian Era, with its six main divisions, 38 subdivisions, and 30,000 chapters, a classification now used in the Library of Congress. Two works of the Ming dynasty include the *National Bibliography of Historical Literature*, the outstanding selective bibliography; and the *Four Treas-*

uries. Mr. Li also summed up the kinds of modern bibliographies. He next spoke of the scope and the functions, showing how the spirit of China must change from private collections to public, and how these lists represent the interests of the learned people in different periods. As to their characteristics, they are arranged by classes, not alphabetically, giving title first, the number of chapters, location of copies, author and his birth date and his title and degrees, descriptive annotations and contents, and the character of seals. The number of pages is never given. This would seem to be very satisfactory, but Mr. Li criticized the carelessness and lack of thoroughness of the older scholars. Mr. Li then outlined the bibliographical needs, and the necessity of hard-working scholarship, and asked for co-operation.

The treasurer's report, of date December 31, 1923, indicated 213 members, of whom 33 were new, and 7 life-members, the total being the largest the Society has ever recorded. There is barely enough money to pay for the 1923 *Papers*. The life-membership fund contains \$457. The question of the contribution to the *Gesammt Katalog der Incunabula* was discussed, and it was decided to find out exactly the status of this before taking action relative to a contribution.

The Committee on Nomination reported in favor of re-electing the same officers, and they were duly elected, as follows: President, A. S. Root; First Vice-President, H. M. Lydenberg; Second Vice-President, Charles Martel; Secretary, A. H. Shearer, Grosvenor Library, Buffalo; Treasurer, F. W. Faxon, Roslindale, Massachusetts; Councilor, G. A. Plimpton, New York City.

A. H. SHEARER, *Secretary*



The Papers of the
Bibliographical Society
of America

Volume XVII Part One 1923

The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America

THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA, which was founded in 1904 during the Conference of Librarians at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, on the initiative of the Bibliographical Society of Chicago, has for its object the promotion of bibliographical research and the printing of bibliographical productions. The Society has met semi-annually since that date. The annual meeting is ordinarily held in connection with the American Library Association. A winter meeting is frequently held in connection with the American Historical Association. At these meetings many papers of interest to bibliographers, book collectors, and librarians have been read, and these have been published in the volumes of the Society's PAPERS.

Any person interested in the object of the Society and approved by the Council may become a member upon payment of \$3.00 a year. Names may be submitted to any officer of the Society.

The treasurer is Frederick W. Faxon, Roslindale, Mass.

The Papers of the Society are published at The University of Chicago Press, 5750-58 Ellis Ave., Chicago, Ill. The subscription price is \$4.00 per year. The price of this part is \$2.00.

Communications concerning editorial matters may be addressed to the Chairman of the Publication Committee, George Parker Winship, The Widener Library, Cambridge, Mass.

Correspondence concerning yearly subscriptions and single copies may be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, 5750-58 Ellis Ave., Chicago, Ill. Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to The University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following representatives of The University of Chicago Press are authorized to quote the prices indicated:

For the British Empire: The Cambridge University Press, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4, England. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, 18s. 6d. each.

For Japan and Korea: The Maruzen-Kabushiki-Kaisha, 11 to 16 Nihonbashi Tori Sancho-me, Tokyo, Japan. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, Yen 8.40.

For China: The Mission Book Company, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, \$4.15 each.

Claims for missing numbers should be made promptly. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers only when they have been lost in transit.